

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/712,114	11/13/2003	Robert J. Yatka	1391/1561	7674		
7590 08/19/2004		EXAMINER				
Steven P. Shurtz BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			CORBIN, ARTHUR L			
P.O. BOX 1039			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CHICAGO, IL	60610		1761			
			DATE MAILED: 08/19/200	4		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				1		φ
	Application No.		Applicant(s	, ,	- 1.	. /
Office Action Summary	Examiner	14	IAT	K/A	FT AL	
cinco noncincumary	A (_	Grou	ip Art Unit	
	ARTHUR L	~	3K-13(N	17	61	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sh	eet bei	neath the c	orresp	ondence ad	dress-
eriod for Reply	_					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE		_ MONTH((S) FRO	M THE MAI	LING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defending to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	, a reply within the statute fault, expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the appli	tory minir ITHS fror cation to	mum of thirty m the mailing become ABA	(30) days date of t	will be consid his communica D (35 U.S.C. §	lered timely. ation. 133).
tatus						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	04					·
This action is FINAL.						
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance excaccordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1	cept for formal matter 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.	rs, pros G. 213.	ecution as	to the	merits is cl	osed in
isposition of Claims						
Claim(s) 6,11,24-27,30-31		_ is/are pending in the application.				
7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		is/are	pending	g in the appl	ication.
Of the above claim(s)						
Of the above claim(s)			is/are	withdra allowed	wn from cor	
Of the above claim(s)			is/are	withdra allowed	wn from cor	
Of the above claim(s)			is/are is/are is/are	withdra allowed rejected	wn from cor I. J.	
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s)			is/are is/are is/are is/are	withdra allowed rejected objecte	wn from cor I. J.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s)			is/are is/are is/are is/are is/are are su	withdra allowed rejected objecte	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s)			is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Papers	is □ appr	oved [is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Deplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is □ appr	oved [is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Poplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are of	is □ approjected to by the Exa	oved [is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Pplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	is □ approjected to by the Exa	oved [is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Poplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	is □ appn ojected to by the Exa	oved (is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Deplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	is □ appn ojected to by the Exa	oved (is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Deplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are of The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priori	is □ approjected to by the Exa	oved (is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin	withdra allowed rejected objected bject to ement	wn from cor I. J. d to.	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Poplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are of The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. All Osome* None of the:	is □ appropiected to by the Exa r. ity under 35 U.S.C. §	oved [miner 119 (a)-	is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin disapprov	withdra allowed rejected object to ement wed.	wn from cord. d. d to. erestriction of	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Pplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. All Cartified copies of the priority documents have been	is □ appropiected to by the Exact. ity under 35 U.S.C. § en received. en received in Applica	oved [miner 119 (a)-	is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin disapprov	withdra allowed rejected object to ement wed.	wn from cord. d. d to. erestriction of	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Pplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. All Come* None of the: Certified copies of the priority documents have been	is □ approjected to by the Exact. ity under 35 U.S.C. § en received. en received in Application in the proceived in the pro	oved (miner 119 (a)- ation No	is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin disapprov	withdra allowed rejected object to ement wed.	wn from cord. d. d to. erestriction of	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Peplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. All Cartified copies of the priority documents have been Certified copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents	is □ appropiected to by the Exact. ity under 35 U.S.C. § en received. en received in Applicatents have been received. ponal Bureau (PCT Rui	oved [miner 119 (a)-ation Noved le 17.2(a	is/are is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin disapprov (d).	withdra allowed rejected object to ement wed.	wn from cord. d. d to. erestriction of	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Pplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priori All Some* Certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been compared to the certified copies of th	is □ appropiected to by the Exact. ity under 35 U.S.C. § en received. en received in Applicatents have been received. ponal Bureau (PCT Rui	oved [miner 119 (a)-ation Noved le 17.2(a	is/are is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin disapprov (d).	withdra allowed rejected object to ement wed.	wn from cord. d. d to. erestriction of	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Pplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. All Some* None of the: Certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the certif	is □ appropiected to by the Exact. ity under 35 U.S.C. § en received. en received in Applicational Bureau (PCT Rui	oved [miner 119 (a)- ation No ved le 17.2(a	is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requind disapprov (d).	withdra allowed rejected object to ement yed.	wn from cord. d. d to. erestriction of	sideration.
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Pplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. All Some* None of the: Certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the priority documents have	is □ appropiected to by the Exact. ity under 35 U.S.C. § en received. en received in Applicational Bureau (PCT Rui	oved [miner 119 (a)- ation No ved le 17.2(a	is/are is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin disapprov (d).	withdra allowed rejected object to ement ved.	wn from cord. d. d. ed to. erestriction of	or election
Of the above claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Pplication Papers The proposed drawing correction, filed on The drawing(s) filed on The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. All Some* None of the: Certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been copies of the certified copies	is □ appropiected to by the Exact. ity under 35 U.S.C. § en received. en received in Applicated to the property of the pro	oved [miner 119 (a)- ation No ved le 17.2(a	is/are is/are is/are is/are is/are are su requin disapprov (d).	withdra allowed rejected object to ement wed.	wn from cord. d. d to. erestriction of	or election

Art Unit: 1761

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The amended paragraph on page 1, lines 6-8 of the spec. omits the current status of parent SN 09/731,036.

Appropriate correction is required.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 6, 11, 24-27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no support in the original disclosure for mixing an additional high-potency sweetener with the N-substituted aspartame derivative "before it is applied in the rolling compound" (claim 6) or "in the coating" (claim 11). Correction is required.
- 5. Claims 6, 11, 24-27, 30 and 31 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1761

Claims 6, 11, 24-27, 30 and 31 fail to recite a positive method step of "applying". Correction is required.

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 6, 11, 24-27, 30 and 31 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nofre et al (5,460,668, columns 4-6 and claim 3) in view of Yatka et al (4,997,659, column 6).

Nofre et al discloses mixing applicant's claimed N-substituted aspartame derivative and alitame, as claimed in claims 6 and 11, and then adding the entire mixture to chewing gum. It would have been obvious to add the sweetening agent combination in Nofre et al, i.e. a combination of N-substituted aspartame derivative and alitame, to chewing gum as part of a rolling compound or coating on a gum pellet since it is old to incorporate alitame in chewing gum as part of a rolling compound or gum pellet coating, as evidenced by Yatka et al.

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double

Art Unit: 1761

patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 6, 11, 24-27, 30 and 31 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,692,778 in view of Yatka et al (4,997,659, column 6).

Yatka et al is applied to the claimed method in 6,692,778 in the same manner as it is applied in paragraph No. 7 above.

10. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/731,036. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1761

Page 5

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Arthur L. Corbin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1399. The examiner can generally be reached on Monday--Friday from 10:30 to 8:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.L. Corbin/dh August 16, 2004 ARTHURL. CORBIN PRIMARY EXAMINER 8 - 18 - 04